

26th February 2018

Cairngorms National Park Authority
FREEPOST NAT 21454
Grantown-on-Spey

Dear CNPA Planning Department

Cairngorms National Park Authority Main Issues Report consultation - Carrbridge H1


I am writing to respond to the CNPA's consultation on the Main Issues Report, specifically the section on preferred sites for housing in Carrbridge (p.79). In this, you recommend that H1 (Carr Road) be retained as an allocation of 72 houses. I am writing to express my view that this allocation is wholly inappropriate for Carr Road and for Carrbridge:

- 72 houses built in this location will **increase traffic to a dangerous and totally unacceptable level**. Carr Road is a narrow road, with barely sufficient room for two cars to pass, and few locations where pedestrians can step off the road. It is an important route to school for primary school children and route to the bus stop for secondary school students. An increase in traffic on the scale proposed, would pose a danger to these and other users. **Plans we have seen include a footpath which is longer and less convenient than the current route into the village - other than for residents in the proposed development. Currently Carr Road is a favourite place to cycle with young families or for people as yet unsure of their ability in cycling as well as those, including tourists, who prefer the quiet road to Grantown rather than the faster, winding A938.**
- Developers have suggested that 72 houses will double the number of cars on Carr Road. This is an enormous change in the level of use. Add to this the fact that the developers' assessment included the cars turning into Carr Road from houses right next to the junction with the Main Road, and it is clear that the number of cars travelling the full length of Carr Road will actually increase by far more than double, **specially bearing in mind that the houses will be furthest away from the village, thus encouraging extra car use. An additional reason for much more than a doubling of traffic is that most will be two-car households and quite likely commuters. (Some, of course, could be second home owners - neither group is appropriate for Carrbridge or anywhere else in the National Park.**
- I am aware that previous proposals for housing here were based on access from the main road (B9153) on the southern approach to the village. This was proposed precisely because Carr Road does not have capacity to accommodate the traffic associated with such a development. Those development proposals failed because access from the B 9153 is unacceptable on an environmental basis. For the planners to now be trying to put the traffic flow back onto Carr Road, as a 'fix' to enable the development to go ahead, demonstrates woeful disregard for the original judgements about the suitability of Carr Road to accommodate such a major increase in traffic flows.
- A development of 72 houses in Carrbridge is totally disproportionate and inappropriate. It will completely alter the scale and character of the village. I, and many other Carrbridge residents feel passionately that the character of where we live is very special, and - far from protecting this - the CNPA's proposals threaten the very nature of our community. **Houses are needed by those who live and work in the area.**
- I believe that an **appropriate scale of development in this location in Carrbridge is 12 houses. These would need to be 25% affordable housing, with the remainder as low to mid-market housing to meet local demand.** The development should also include some communal recreational space. This scale and pattern would be commensurate with the

character of our village. I believe any development bigger than this, on Carr Road, would be against the interests of our community.

- I have heard the argument from developers that such a small scale and low-cost development is not worth their while; that, to be profitable for them, a development needs to be large, and comprised of expensive houses. I don't believe this to be true, or in the local interest. Smaller developments, of lower cost houses are suitable for local building firms to take on. The CNPA should not be pressed into a development which is in the interests of big-scale building companies, and against the wishes and needs of local communities. Better still, some members of the community would welcome the opportunity for self-build plots.
- In previous consultations, the Planning Department has received many letters from Carrbridge residents expressing views that a large-scale development of this type on Carr Road is not appropriate. Many of us feel we have written on numerous occasions to express our concern about what is proposed here. When the CNPA Board came to see the site, 100 residents turned out to express our objection. As a community we have made our views clear and we have expressed them firmly. To see the National Park Authority persisting with a proposal to which there is clear community opposition, is, to say the least, disheartening - it gives us little faith that the Authority acknowledges and values the community view. **Have the developers any target market for these houses (other than the highest payer?) If not, this is grounds in itself for refusal. If yes, do they fit in with CNPA planning policies? It seems that the CNPA is not taking any notice of the interests or wishes of the current population, Is profitability for the applicant the sole criterion?**
- I also have concerns about the practicality of constructing a development along Carr Road, in particular the difficulty of access for construction vehicles, given the narrow nature of the road, and the difficulty large vehicles have turning into Carr Road. **Even if all the new residents were non-car users this should be sufficient reason to refuse permission to the development.**
- Finally, I am aware that previously the CNPA has recognised the concerns of many of our community and sought to reduce the number of houses that has been proposed for site H1. The position of the CNPA was then overturned by the Scottish Government. It is for this reason that I am copying my letter to Fergus Ewing MSP, so that he is aware of the strength of feeling about this proposed development in our community.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular box redacting the signature of the sender.

Cc Fergus Ewing MSP